DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 414 RC 018 030

AUTHOR Duke, Charles R.; Gates, Robin
TITLE The Status of Teacher Induction Programs in Rural Pennsylvania School Districts.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education, Harrisburg. Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching.
PUB DATE Dec 90
NOTE 81p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *Beginning Teacher Induction; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Mentors; Needs Assessment; *Program Evaluation; *Rural Schools; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Orientation; Teacher Role; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Thirty-nine rural school districts in Pennsylvania responded to a survey designed to study new teacher induction programs. The total sample population of 392 included mentor/support teachers, inductees, and induction coordinators. Based on the survey data and information from 29 districts' documents, this report gives detailed descriptions of these groups' characteristics, needs, training, and responsibilities. Recommendations for strengthening future plans are: (1) mentor training should be a key component in any induction plan and districts should allow sufficient time; (2) time must be found within the regular constraints of the teaching day for mentors and inductees to work together; (3) closer attention needs to be paid to the design and use of the inductee needs assessment and the design of a program's final evaluation in districts; (4) districts should develop specific guidelines in their written induction plans for meeting the needs of experienced teachers new to a district as well as the needs of specialized teacher populations; (5) higher education should be involved in district induction programs; and (6) improvement in communication with all parties involved in the district's induction program is needed. Further information about the survey participants is presented in appendices, as well as several survey instruments. (KS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED329414

THE STATUS OF TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS IN RURAL PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A Report Prepared by

Dr. Charles R. Duke
Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Dr. Robin Gates
Riverview Intermediate Unit
R.D. 2, Greencrest Drive
Shippenville, Pennsylvania 16254

for

The Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching

December 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles R. Duke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC018030

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview..... 1

Summary of Findings..... 5

The Districts..... 8

Mentors..... 14

Inductees..... 25

Induction Coordinators' Program Assessment..... 36

TIP Evaluation, Record Keeping and Recognition..... 38

Recommendations and Discussion..... 40

Bibliography..... 49

Appendices

A. Participating School Districts..... 51

B. Principal Responsibilities Within A Rural Induction Plan..... 52

C. Rural Mentor Characteristics..... 53

D. Rural Mentor Training Topics..... 54

E. Rural Mentor Responsibilities..... 55

F. Rural Inductee Responsibilities..... 56

G. Sample Assessment Instrument..... 57

H. Rural Districts' Needs Assessment Topics..... 60

I. Orientation Topics for Rural Inductees..... 64

J Induction Coordinator Survey..... 65

K. Mentor Survey..... 69

L. Inductee Survey..... 73

M. Follow-up Mentor Survey..... 77

PROFILE OF THE INDUCTION PROGRAMS IN PENNSYLVANIA RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

I. OVERVIEW

In 1986, the state of Pennsylvania, recognizing as did many other states, (Huling-Austin, 1986; Hank and Robards, 1987), the need to provide stronger and more effective support for beginning teachers, addressed the issue through a mandate from the State Board of Education and the enactment of legislation (Pennsylvania Code, Title 22, Chapter 49.16). The Board mandated that induction programs for beginning teachers be developed and that participation in one of these approved programs was necessary, beginning June 1, 1987, for permanent certification in Pennsylvania. The Teacher Induction Program or TIP was to be the responsibility of individual school districts and each district was charged with developing a written TIP plan and submitting it for approval by the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

The original guidelines for developing induction plans defined such programs as "planned experiences, activities, and studies...to increase the beginning teacher's knowledge and improve his/her teaching skills." Early plans stressed the development of teacher knowledge about the school and the district but did not provide an equal amount of emphasis upon the development of teaching skills. As a result, revised guidelines appeared in 1987 to reemphasize the "distinction between orientation activities and the development and refinement of professional skills" (PDE, 1987).

The end of the 1989-90 school year marked the completion of the first two year cycle for districts' induction plans. Districts who had participated in this first cycle were required to produce revised plans for a new two year cycle, running from 1990-1992; other districts on a different sequence, face revisions

in 1991 for 1991-93, and still others are on a cycle for their revisions to be approved by 1992 for 1992-94. A set of guidelines from PDE for developing the revised plans appeared in 1990, but the guidelines showed no major changes from those prepared in 1987.

In 1988, the Professional Practices Committee, a part of the Pennsylvania Professional Standards and Practices Commission, carried out a state-wide study, "Teacher Induction Survey for First-Year Teaching Assignments 1987-1988," to determine "if the induction process was being implemented according to the guidelines established by the Pennsylvania Department of Education and if the participants perceived any benefits from the programs." Results came from 115 different school districts and intermediate units (Schultz 1988). Findings from the survey suggested that participants were deriving benefits from the process and that, in general, districts were complying with the guidelines. A second study conducted by Kathleen Ann Caracciolo (1989) focused on the attitudes of mentors and inductees toward the mandated TIP and found in a limited sample of two intermediate units and four school districts that response was highly favorable.

In 1990, as a result of a grant funded by the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching, a third study, focusing on the induction process in rural school districts, was undertaken in a collaborative project between Riverview Intermediate Unit 6 and the College of Education and Human Services at Clarion University. The study was an integral part of a grant which in its entirety focused not only on surveying practices in rural school districts but also on developing appropriate training models and resources which could be used by these districts to further strengthen their induction plans. Fifty-four rural school districts originally agreed to participate in the study; 39 ultimately responded

to the initial survey. Thirty of the 39 responded as well to a follow-up survey on mentor practices and training.

Survey Population

Since this project focused on induction practices in rural school districts, the definition of "rural" became a crucial factor in identifying which districts would be contacted. For the purposes of this study, "rural" was defined as those districts located in counties clearly not urban-influenced and where the presence of small cities or towns (over 10,000 population) is infrequent. Population density overall had to be less than 75 residents per square mile (Moyer, 1988). Pennsylvania has 92 school districts situated within 24 counties fitting this definition.

This report provides a summary of the data collected on 39 school districts representing 19 of the 24 counties (79 percent) considered rural in Pennsylvania. All but two of these districts' induction plans have been in operation since 1987; two districts predate that time. Data, therefore, are based on the experiences of the districts in the first induction cycle; data collection from mentor/support teachers and inductees was restricted to the completion of the 1989-90 school year. Results from the survey of this population are compared with results from Schultz (1988) where possible.

Thirty-nine (39) or 42 percent of the 92 rural districts in Pennsylvania provided the information upon which this report is based. (See Appendix A for a list of participating districts.) Responding from these districts were 179 mentor/ support teachers, 178 inductees, and 35 induction coordinators for a total sample population of 392. Schultz's survey (1988) included data from 1500 respondents but no attempt was made in his survey to distinguish whether respondents were from rural, urban, or suburban districts.

Survey Design

Separate surveys (see Appendices J, K, and L) were developed for three populations: (1) district induction coordinators; (2) mentor/support teachers; (3) inductees. Items from the Schultz survey were incorporated into the surveys and other questions added. The induction coordinators received 31 questions, 16 of which were drawn from the Schultz study; mentors received 33 questions, 22 of which came from the Schultz study; and inductees received 31 questions, 29 of which were from Schultz. All responses were machine scored except for responses to two or three questions on each survey which required written information; those were tabulated manually.

Induction coordinators in the 39 districts agreed to distribute, collect and return all of the surveys for the three populations. In addition, 29 coordinators provided copies of their written Teacher Induction Plans. Initial survey distribution and data collection occurred in late spring of 1990; follow-up survey and data collection occurred in fall 1990 (see Appendix M).

Organization of this Report

The report provides separate sections devoted to discussions of the results from the induction coordinators, the mentor/support teachers, and the inductees, as well as a review of written district plans. Included in the report are comparisons to the Schultz survey data where appropriate. The report concludes with recommendations and discussion.

Findings

The findings listed below are based on an analysis of data representing 39 rural Pennsylvania school districts and include survey responses from 35 district induction coordinators, 178 mentors, and 179 inductees, as well as analysis of 29 districts' written induction plans. Findings also reflect data from the follow-up survey.

1. The majority of rural districts spend more than $1500 on their induction plans annually.
2. The majority of rural districts have less than 300 teachers on their staffs.
3. Rural districts use building induction teams as the main unit for carrying out a district's TIP.
4. Rural districts will waive portions of a TIP for teachers but the basis on which the waiver will be granted, and the documentation which will be required are not clearly explained in districts' written plans.
5. Principals are a key component in the success of a district's TIP.
6. Over 60 percent of the rural districts reported having only 5-10 trained mentors available to work with inductees.
7. Over 90 percent of the rural mentors are white Caucasian, over 30 years of age and are full-time classroom teachers.
8. Over 70 percent of the rural mentors have taught for more than 12 years and 67 percent have a master's or a master's plus.
9. Mentors receive less than a 25 percent reduction in teaching load, typically work with one inductee, and over 50 percent receive no compensation for their mentoring.

10. Induction coordinators and mentors disagree on the need for training of mentors.
11. Sixty-six percent of the mentors have taken academic course-work in the last four years.
12. Less than 25 percent of the rural districts indicate in their written plans that mentor training is carried out.
13. Mentors may have up to 23 different tasks or responsibilities to carry out.
14. Seventy-two percent of mentors shared a common certification/teaching assignment with their inductees.
15. Slightly over 50 percent of mentors report weekly contact with their inductees.
16. Forty-three percent of the mentors do no direct classroom observation of their inductees' teaching.
17. Sixty-four percent of mentors receive no released time for conferences with their inductees.
18. Only 18 percent of the mentors share results of their classroom observations with the administration.
19. Mentors perceive themselves as peer coaches.
20. Only 8 percent of the mentors held a supervisory or administrative certificate and only 35 percent had been lead teachers.
21. Rural mentors typically work in schools with less than 40 faculty.
22. The average number of inductees hired by rural districts during 1989-90 was 4.
23. Inductees tend to be white Caucasian females, 26 years or older, and possess a bachelor's degree but 21 percent of

the population had a master's or higher and 36 percent were 36 or older.

24. Fifty percent of the inductees had prior teaching experience.

25. More inductees appeared at the high school level (7-12) than at the elementary level.

26. The content of needs assessment instruments varies widely from district to district while the design of the assessments show marked similarities.

27. Rural inductees are not likely to receive information about cultural differences.

28. Over 60 percent of rural inductees report having access to a professional library of materials and resources.

29. Over 70 percent of inductees report having opportunities to observe peers in teaching situations.

30. Over 50 percent of inductees report that released time for conferences with mentors was not available.

31. Only 45 percent of inductees report having their mentors observe their classroom teaching.

32. Only six percent of the district induction plans include a role for higher education.

33. No district induction plans showed involvement by the community.

34. Inductees and mentors show close agreement on strengths and weaknesses of district TIPs, but show less agreement with strengths and weaknesses identified by district coordinators.

35. Comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of induction plans appears to be lacking in many rural districts.

II. THE DISTRICTS

The state guidelines for developing and implementing TIP plans provide for the identification of a district induction coordinator, induction councils for the district and for each school building, mentors, and inductees. Each of these will be examined in the following discussion. The data reported in this section are drawn from the self-reporting surveys and from the submitted TIP plans. (Note: in some cases, selected questions were not answered by all respondents; hence tallies may not always indicate 100 percent.)

Of the thirty-nine districts reporting, 40 percent had more than 1800 students enrolled, 28 percent had enrollments between 1,000-1,400 and 11 percent report student enrollment from 600-1,000. In terms of teaching staff, 60 percent of the districts reported having between 100-150 teachers, 22 percent reported teaching staff of over 150 but only 1 district reported a teaching staff of more than 300. In terms of number of inductees, 28 percent of the districts had 1-2 inductees, 22 percent reported 3-5, 20 percent had 6-8 and 22 percent reported 9 or more. The average was 4. The total number of inductees handled by the districts since their induction plans began is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Total Inductee Population Served Since
Rural District Induction Plans Implemented
(N = 30 districts)

Elementary	102
Secondary	131
Other	13
Total:	246

To work with inductees, 65 percent of the districts reported having 5-10 trained mentors, 5 percent had 11-15, another 5 percent had 16-24, 2 percent had 25-30 while only one district indicated over 30 mentors were available. Forty-eight percent of the districts reported that carrying out their TIP plans involved a cost of over $1500 while 11 percent of the districts indicated they spend less than $100 on the program.

As might be expected, each superintendent has the overall responsibility for seeing that an approved TIP is in place in his or her district. State guidelines (PDE 1987, 1990) call for the superintendent to select an induction coordinator, to form induction/building councils and to assume overall responsibility for the development of an induction plan. Among the duties expected of the superintendent, as documented in 29 districts' written plans, are the following:

1. Oversee continuing development of district plan.
2. Establish induction program files in district office.
3. Direct initial induction orientation to district facilities and functions.
4. Submit reports to PDE.
5. Review inductee progress and certify completion of process.
6. Send letters soliciting volunteers as support teachers.
7. Select support teachers.
8. Conduct periodic meetings of district and/or building teams.
9. Oversee evaluation of program and make changes as appropriate.
10. See that inductees and support teachers receive appropriate recognition.
11. Keep on file names of those who complete induction program.

Induction Coordinators

In some districts, an induction coordinator apart from the superintendent is appointed to monitor the operation of the district's TIP; in the other districts, the superintendent serves in this capacity. Regardless of who serves as coordinator, that individual will typically be male (83 percent vs 17 percent female), will be a white Caucasian over 45 years of age (60 percent vs 40 percent) and all will have a master's degree. In terms of their longevity in the coordinator position, no clear pattern emerges; 22 percent report being in the position for one year or less, 37 percent have had two years of experience, 25 percent have had three years and 14 percent reported more than three. None of the coordinators received released time for their TIP responsibilities.

An examination of the 29 written TIP plans suggests that no real consensus exists about what the coordinator may be asked to do. In some plans, there is little or no attention given to identifying specific duties; however, in those with specified duties, the following appear most frequently:

1. Evaluate and revise induction program annually.
2. Conduct meetings with support administrators, mentor teachers and inductees.
3. Organize and orient induction teams.
4. Call meetings of induction council.

Induction Councils

PDE guidelines (1987, 1990) call for the creation of induction councils but do not specify that there must be a district council and a building council. However, in all 29 written plans used as a basis for this study, both district and building induction councils are indicated.

District Councils. As might be expected, the membership of these councils varies from district to district, but all district councils include the elementary and high school principals, middle school principal if appropriate, the superintendent, and the district coordinator (if different from the superintendent); at least one classroom teacher from each level, elementary through secondary, is a council member. The number of teachers on the council varies, however, from a low of one from each level to three or four from each of the levels. In cases where the district council may also double as the building council, inductees are included in the membership. Others who might be included in the membership but who appear very infrequently in the plans are teacher education association representatives, assistant principals, and department heads or lead teachers. Although state guidelines suggest including in the membership representatives from higher education and the community, only 2 districts (6 percent) report having higher education representation and no districts show any involvement by the community.

Of those councils indicating the frequency of their meetings, 6 reported meeting twice a year, 2 met three times a year, and one met quarterly. Their responsibilities, for the most part, parallel those in the 1990 PDE Guidelines and can be summarized as follows:

1. Serve as overall advisory group for the induction plan.
2. Serve as a clearinghouse of ideas for mentor teachers and inductees.
3. Approve any modifications and/or revisions in the TIP plan prior to approval by superintendent and/or school board.
4. Evaluate the TIP and recommend improvements on an annual basis.
5. Waive portions of induction program upon petition by the inductee.

Building Councils. All 29 districts submitting written plans had building level councils although these are not mandated in PDE Guidelines. In one or two cases, the district and building councils were one unit because of the smallness of the district. Typically, the building councils or building induction teams, as they are more commonly called in the written plans, consisted of the building principal, one or more inductees, one or more mentors, and support people such as school psychologist, curriculum coordinators, or special programs personnel who could be called upon needed. One district, however, included all building personnel, including janitorial and cafeteria workers, on the building team. Building teams met at least twice a year, with three districts' plans indicating they met monthly.

The responsibilities of these teams tend to parallel those of the district council but also include some more specific tasks:

1. Assist the inductee in meeting goals/objectives of the TIP plan.
2. Coordinate appropriate inservice programs for inductees as determined by their needs assessments.
3. Orient faculty to the TIP plan.
4. Orient inductee to building level management functions and support services.
5. Individualize the induction process to meet the needs of inductees.
6. Evaluate building programs and provide reports to the district council.
7. Waive portions of the induction plan for those professional employees showing evidence of prior experience or knowledge in those areas.

Although district councils and building teams are portrayed as having different roles in the induction process, there appears to be a division on whether the building teams or the district councils should be the agent to

determine if any portions of the TIP should be waived for an inductee. None of the written plans provided any indication of how the appeal process might work or what documentation an inductee might have to produce to have a waiver approved. The PDE guidelines make no mention of waivers for the TIP.

Principal's Role. A key to the success of individual building teams working effectively is the role which the principal accepts and plays. In most of the written induction plans, the principal's responsibilities were at least alluded to and in a number of cases made quite specific. These responsibilities, however, varied widely, offering no particular consistent pattern across districts. Among the responsibilities identified for the principal were the following (for a complete listing of responsibilities and their frequency, see Appendix B):

1. Orient inductee to building level management functions and support services
2. Participate in support teacher selection and training while carrying out regular duties
3. Update superintendent and/or induction coordinator of program progress throughout year
4. Implement induction program elements within building
5. Monitor mentor-inductee relationships
6. Participate in training sessions(s) with coordinator to discuss induction program and training model for support teachers
7. Orient building faculty to induction program
8. Suggest changes in program when appropriate
9. Provide release time for mentor to observe inductees
10. Serve as information conduit to support teachers for district written policies and procedures

III. MENTORS

The role of the mentor, or support teacher, is crucial to the success of any assistance program for beginning teachers (Bey and Holmes, 1990). PDE (1990) guidelines on the selection and use of mentors indicate that mentors should be certified, recognized by their peers as outstanding teachers, and have at least one year of teaching experience in the district. In addition, mentors should be qualified for their roles either by previous training or by receiving appropriate training.

Rural Mentor Characteristics. In this study, 179 mentors responded to a survey that addressed their own background as well as the activities they engaged in as mentors. Of the survey population, 58 percent were female, 42 percent male and all but 3 percent were white Caucasian (2 Hispanics and 2 American Indians also appeared in the mentor population). Sixty-four percent of the mentors were between the ages of 31-46, 21 percent between 47-53, and 5 percent were 54 or older; only 7 percent of the mentors were between the ages of 24-30. As might be expected from these percentages, a large number of the mentors had considerable teaching experience (76 percent over 12 years; 15 percent 9-12 years; 6 percent 6-8 years; and only 5 percent 1-5 years). This experience also showed in the percentage of mentors having a master's degree or higher: 32 percent had a master's; 35 percent had a master's plus additional credits.

Only 7 percent of the mentors were not classroom teachers and 93 percent of the mentors were full-time teachers. Their teaching assignments varied, with 20 percent at the K-3 level, 16 percent at grades 1-6 and 55 percent in grades 7-12. The number of teachers in the mentors' schools varied, with 10 percent reporting working with faculty of no more than 15, while 32 percent of the mentors indicated their teaching faculty numbered over 40. The majority of mentors (70 percent) are selected by administrators. This method was verified

in all of the 29 written induction plans as well. Other means of selection, according to the respondents, include volunteering (7 percent) or a combination of volunteering and being selected. In one instance, a mentor reported being selected through the results of an objective test. Only 35 percent of the mentors had been lead teachers and only 8 percent held a supervisory or administrative certificate.

All of the 29 written induction plans submitted for this study devoted a section to identifying the characteristics of teachers who could qualify for becoming mentors. Among the most frequently cited characteristics are those listed below (for a complete listing of characteristics and their frequency of appearance in district criteria, see Appendix C):

1. Chosen by Superintendent
2. Recognized by peers
3. Participates voluntarily
4. Possesses tenure
5. Possesses Instructional II Certificate
6. Exhibits enthusiasm and positive attitude
7. Possesses good organizational skills
8. Has appropriate teaching assignment (grade, subject, level)
9. Possesses good classroom management skills
10. Works well with students and adults

Odell (1990) suggests that mentor/inductee relationships are enhanced if the mentor has the same teaching assignment/certification as the inductee. Forty-one percent of the written plans indicated this as a qualification for selection as a mentor; 72 percent of the mentors indicated that they share a common certification/teaching assignment with their inductees.

In reporting on their working conditions, all mentors indicated that they received less than a 25 percent reduction in their teaching load; 94 percent reported working with only 1 inductee while 6 percent reported working with 2-3 inductees. Only 64 percent receive extra compensation for working as mentors; 4 percent reported receiving released time in lieu of monetary compensation. Actual monetary compensation appears to vary greatly, ranging from a low of $150. to a high of $700. See Table 2.

Table 2

Mentor Monetary Compensation
(N = 19 Districts)

$150	=	1
$200	=	1
$300	=	1
$400	=	4
$500	=	5
$504	=	1
$530	=	1
$600	=	1
$644	=	1
$700	=	2

In one case, conditions were applied to the monetary compensation restricting the recipient to using the stipend only on the following: (a) educational travel; (b) attendance at conventions; (c) classroom supplies. In cases where released time was provided, mentors might be released from homeroom and for one period a day (high school) or from bus duty and clerical duties (elementary); in all other instances, a mentor could receive an additional three non-accumulated personal days.

Mentor Training. When queried about the training necessary for becoming a mentor, 69 percent indicated that they did not feel special training was necessary. District coordinators, however, reported that one of the weaknesses of the TIP in their districts was the lack of training for mentors. In fact, 78 percent of the mentors indicated that they had received no special training. In

terms of their own regular professional development, 39 percent of the mentors reported that they had not taken any academic coursework for more than four years while 22 percent indicated they had taken at least one course in the last year and 38 percent had taken some coursework in the last four years. Of those mentors who did receive training, 36 percent found the training not to be useful, while 50 percent thought their training was somewhat useful.

Less than 25 percent of the district written induction plans acknowledged the need for training of mentors. Those districts which did include a description of their training programs did not show any pattern of consistency in terms of the topics or skills that might form the basis of mentor training. Among the topics most often identified by the districts are the following (for a complete listing, see Appendix D):

a. Classroom management

b. Effective teaching strategies

c. Philosophy of district and/or school

d. Knowledge of curriculum

e. Communication skills

f. Concerns of new teachers

g. Conferencing skills

h. Effective teaching components

Mentor Responsibilities. Mentors can anticipate that their work with inductees will involve a variety of experiences (Newcombe, 1988). A survey of the written induction plans identified 23 possible tasks or responsibilities for mentors. Among the most frequently mentioned are the following (For a listing of all 23, see Appendix E):

a. Holds meetings with inductee

b. Establishes a positive, professional rapport with assigned inductee

c. Serves as resource person on all inservice topics within realm of expertise

d. Formally meets with inductees before, after, or during school to discuss induction related topics

e. Participates in training session(s) with district coordinators to discuss induction plan goals and activities

f. Observes inductees teaching in their regular classroom setting

g. Keeps a log of all meetings

h. Participates in evaluation of induction program and makes suggestions for improvements

i. Serves as a role model and professional support person to help inductees in all aspects of adjustment to their new teaching positions

j. Arranges classroom observations for inductee to observe other teachers, including mentor

k. Assists in development of individualized induction plan with inductee based on self-assessment results

From district to district some noticeable differences appear in the amount of time mentors are expected to devote to working with their inductees. For example, there seems to be no pattern in terms of how often mentor and inductee meet to discuss progress, questions, etc. Fifty-seven percent indicate they meet weekly with their inductees, 29 percent meet monthly, 6 percent meet once a quarter and 3 percent once a quarter; one mentor reported meeting only once a year with an inductee. The written plans also tend to offer a smorgasbord of approaches to direct contact between mentor and inductee:

a. Weekly for first 3 months and then bi-weekly

b. Weekly throughout year

c. Monthly

d. Bi-monthly

e. Bi-weekly

f. Twice weekly for weeks 1-3; once a week for weeks 4-18; bi-weekly for weeks 19-36

g. Weekly during first semester

h. Weekly for first three months

i. Weekly during first month of school; twice a month until Thanksgiving; monthly thereafter

j. Weekly first month; bi-weekly second month; monthly rest of year

k. Weekly first month; monthly for remainder of year

l. 40 quality hours a year

In addition to requiring mentors to meet with their inductees on a regular basis, at least 41 percent of the written plans indicate that mentors are to conduct regular classroom observations of inductees' teaching. Apparently this is a practice which some mentors follow (42 percent) while others (43 percent) indicate they do no observations. In fact, 71 percent reported that they had no regular schedule for classroom observations of their inductees. Some of the reason for this disparity may be found in the fact that 64 percent of the mentors report that they receive no released time for conferences with inductees. The written plans, again, reveal a variety of expectations in terms of classroom observation:

a. Quarterly

b. Four in first three months and then two for remainder of year

c. Weekly during first month of school; twice a month until Thanksgiving; monthly thereafter

d. At least 8 visits a year

e. Three during first month; two the second month and then once a month for remainder of year

f. Twice each semester for half-day each time

g. Three in first three months; three for remainder of year

h. Twice during the year

i. Once a marking period

Results of classroom observations are not shared on a regular basis with the school administration according to 42 percent of the mentors; however, 18 percent indicated that they did share such results; 32 percent of the sample did not respond to this question.

Another responsibility for mentors, noted in 27 percent of the written plans, is to arrange classroom observations for inductees during which the inductees can observe other teachers, including the mentor, in actual teaching situations. Again, there seemed to be no consistent pattern in terms of the frequency with which this would be done; four districts specified that such observations should take place but offered no guidance on the number; other districts ranged from a high of eight visits during the year to one quarterly.

In the needs assessments given to inductees, a variety of topics are identified for which inductees are to indicate whether they feel a need for further training or information. To determine to what extent mentors might be addressing issues from these needs assessments, five topics were selected on a random basis and mentors were asked to indicate if they provided training and/or information on these; for all five, over 50 percent of the mentors indicated they addressed the topics. For the range of percentages, consult Table 3 below.

Table 3

Mentor Response to
Training/Information Needs of Inductees

Classroom Management Techniques	75 percent
District resources--library, professional materials, audio visual	61 percent
Information about district policies, student population, etc.	78 percent
Parent/teacher conferences	55 percent
Instructional approaches to accommodate varied learning styles of students	55 percent

Other areas less frequently mentioned by mentors included information about handling discipline problems, grading, clerical duties such as filling out forms, budgeting, finding teaching resources, etc.

Mentor/Inductee Relationships. Although the amount of contact between mentors and inductees seems to vary widely from district to district, there would be little question that the relationship that develops between the two is a significant component in the success or failure of the TIP. When queried about how they viewed their relationship with inductees, 65 percent of the mentors characterized it as "informal," 29 percent called it "supportive," while only 2 percent labeled it "formal." As far as their roles in the TIP, 95 percent of the mentors saw themselves as peer coaches, 4 percent as supervisors and only 1 percent as evaluators. In reflecting upon whether they would repeat their roles as mentors with other new teachers, 89 percent would serve again. In terms of ranking their district's program on a scale of 1 to 5, with five being highest, for its effectiveness in assisting inductees, 42 percent of the mentors ranked

their programs with a 4 or 5, while 55 percent ranked them at a 3 or below. See Table 4 for the specific distribution of rankings:

Table 4

Mentors' Level of Satisfaction with TIP

1	3 percent
2	12 percent
3	40 percent
4	30 percent
5	12 percent

In assessing the weaknesses of their districts' TIP, mentors offered a variety of insights and suggestions. Most of the criticisms seemed to fall under six basic headings. These are addressed in the order of frequency with which they were mentioned by mentors.

Time. Mentors repeatedly commented on the lack of time to carry out their duties. They found that their schedules were often incompatible with those of their inductees, that not infrequently they found themselves at a considerable distance from where their inductee was located (in some cases, inductee and mentor were not even in the same building and if they were, they were on different floors). The majority of mentors reported that they did not receive any released time to meet with their inductees, observe their classes, conduct follow-up conferences, etc.

Training. Although mentor training was mentioned less often, it still figured prominently in mentors' assessments. In many instances, mentors complained of inadequate explanations of their roles, no support system for mentors when they had questions or problems, and, in general, an assumption that once a mentor and inductee were identified, little else had to be done. Mentors

were not specific in terms of what training they felt might be helpful but clearly there was a sense that districts were not preparing mentors adequately for what mentors found themselves having to do.

Expectations. Accompanying the comments about lack of training were equally frequent comments about the vagueness of districts' expectations for the program as a whole. Mentors requested that more time be given to explaining the purpose of the program, that guidelines for the various expected activities be provided and that, in general, a stronger orientation to the entire induction process be provided for mentors and inductees.

Program Organization. Mentors frequently cited the lack of planning that appeared to have gone into the orientations and meetings held prior to the school year; they commented on the absence of consistency in terms of expectations, timelines, and follow-up. In fact, most often cited in this category was the absence of follow-up in terms of meetings or further instructions for mentors after the initial meeting prior to school.

Flexibility. A number of mentors commented on the fact that districts' TIP were not sufficiently flexible to accommodate a variety of special populations. For example, mentors in areas such as counseling, music, art, physical education, etc., reported that district materials and inservice did not seem to reflect the needs of inductees in these areas. Also cited was the lack of provision for teachers hired after the beginning of the school year; many of them never received orientation to districts' TIP and mentors and inductees often had little contact. A third population identified by mentors was the experienced teacher new to the district. Most districts' plans appear to be directed to the beginning teacher and do not adequately consider the needs of the experienced teacher. Mentors suggested that such teachers might need only an orientation and not a full mentorship.

Materials. Mentors expressed dissatisfaction with materials supplied for them. In some cases, materials were quickly outdated; others were considered unnecessarily lengthy and inappropriate for the audience. Mentors also felt that the paperwork required for the program often was too cumbersome. In some cases forms were provided but no information on how they should be used.

Although mentors felt strongly that improvements could be made in their districts' plans and procedures, they felt equally strongly that their districts' TIPs had some definite strengths.

Support System. Mentors overwhelmingly cited as a strength of the program the support it provided for inductees. They liked that they could be confidantes for the inductee, that there could be a close one-to-one relationship, that they were not cast in the role of evaluators, and that they could ease the pressure usually felt by a beginning teacher. Also cited was the matching of mentor and inductee; mentors felt strongly that a close match between grade level and content assignment as well as physical proximity was essential.

Collegiality. Mentors also liked the fact that the program promoted interaction between inductees and other teachers. Classroom observations of peers, opportunities for common inservice opportunities, and being involved in a team effort were often cited as means for promoting a "good feeling" among staff.

Information. The organization and information provided by districts' TIP were cited as positive factors. Mentors felt that because the program did have some expectations, time-lines, and opportunities for increasing inductees' knowledge and training, the effect on inductees was a positive one.

Overall, mentors showed a reasonable level of satisfaction with their district's induction process, 42 percent rating it at a 4 or 5 level but 52 percent could rate it no higher than a 3, suggesting that from the mentors' point

of view, districts could definitely strengthen a number of elements in their plans and ought to be consulting mentors on a more regular basis about ways to make the program more effective.

IV. INDUCTEES

Teaching is one of the few professions where the beginner is assumed to have as many skills and as much knowledge as the experienced teacher. In recent years, a large body of research has suggested that such assumptions need to be challenged and that beginning teachers should be provided assistance as they make the transition from preparation to application. As Huling-Austin and others (1989) suggest:

> Newly licensed teachers are prepared to **begin** to teach, but they are not thoroughly proficient. They are also not ready to fine-tune their competence without assistance and support. A complete conception and a realistic awareness of being a teacher cannot be gained entirely, simulated exactly, or understood sufficiently in preservice training (p. 2).

Rural Inductee Characteristics. In this study, 178 inductees responded to a survey that addressed their own background as well as the activities they engaged in as part of their participation in their districts' TIP. Of the survey population, 35 percent were male, 65 percent female and 93 percent were white Caucasian (1 American Indian, 1 Asian, 1 Black, and 2 Hispanic made up the balance of the population). Sixty-two percent of the inductees were 26 years of age or older, with 5 percent being over 45 and 31 percent appearing in the range of 36-45; only 38 percent of the inductees were under 25.

As might be expected with an inductee population, the largest percentage of inductees (78 percent) had only a bachelor's degree but 16 percent reported

having a master's and 5 percent reported a master's plus. In Pennsylvania, the Instructional I certificate is issued to most beginning teachers, and 85 percent of the inductees reported they possessed this certificate; 11 percent, however, reported holding other kinds of unspecified certification and 3 of the inductees indicated they were holding emergency certificates.

In terms of prior teaching experience, one might expect to find that inductees would indicate no prior experience but the inductee population was evenly divided between those who did and those who did not. Of those inductees having prior teaching experience, 3 percent reported having between 1-3 years of prior experience, 12 percent reported 4-6 years, and 12 percent indicated more than 6 years of prior experience. (See Pesek, 1990 regarding recruitment practices in rural Pennsylvania districts.) The teaching assignments of the inductee population was heavily weighted toward grades 7-12 (67 percent) vs K-6 (33 percent). See Table 5 below for certification areas represented at the secondary level.

Table 5

Inductee Areas of Certification
at Secondary Level

Accounting and Data Processing	2
Art	1
Biology/Life Science	9
Business Education	5
Chemistry	5
English	10
French/Spanish	4
General Science	2
German	2
Guidance	1
Health/Physical Education	4
History	2
Home Economics	3
Industrial Arts/Tech.Ed	4
Library Science	2
Mathematics	16
Music	9
Reading	5
Social Studies	7
Special Education	7
TOTAL:	100

These self-reported characteristics tend to match fairly well with the inductee characteristics outlined in districts' written induction plans. As might be expected, inductees were most commonly defined by the districts as those individuals new to teaching; however, 17 of the 29 written plans also included in their inductee classification, teachers new to the district and 10 included a provision for long term substitutes to be included in the TIP. One district reported that it required all current staff moving within the district from building to building or from one level to another to participate in the TIP. The provision for teachers new to the district may help to explain the 27 percent of survey inductees who indicated they had one or more years of prior experience.

Inductee Responsibilities. Although inductees receive assistance in a district's TIP, they also have some responsibilities to meet. The written district plans did not show a consistent pattern in terms of what the expectations might be for inductees but the following list of responsibilities are most often cited in district plans (For a complete listing and order of frequency, see Appendix F):

a. Meet on regularly scheduled basis with mentor teacher and/or support administrator

b. Participate in training session with coordinators to discuss induction plan goals and activities

c. Keep journal or log detailing experiences during induction year

d. Participate in group and individual inservice training sessions focusing on areas of emphasis taken from needs assessment

e. Evaluate induction program experience and make suggestions for improvement

f. Complete induction process successfully

g. Establish positive working relationship with mentor

h. Visit other classrooms within subject area to observe other teaching techniques and programs

Inductee Needs Assessment. PDE guidelines (1987, 1990) ask districts to provide information in their written plans about how the districts intend to determine the educational development needs of their inductees. The districts are asked to provide, if possible, a copy of the needs assessment instruments they expect to use in this process. Twenty-eight of the twenty-nine written induction plans examined for this study contained needs assessment information or forms.

The majority of the needs assessment instruments followed a similar design; inductees were asked to assess themselves in terms of what they perceived to be their level of need in learning more about a given topic. In most of the instruments, inductees had a choice of indicating minimal need, moderate need, or strong need. In a limited number of assessment instruments, however, inductees were provided a series of statements and asked to indicate either their agreement or disagreement with the information or to indicate if a statement was true or false. (See Appendix G for a sample of this kind of instrument.)

Most of the assessment instruments grouped items under headings such as effective classroom management, school community relations, etc. In many cases these headings appeared to echo those appearing in both the 1987 and 1990 PDE guidelines. Surprisingly, however, there was no real consensus among the instruments on topics to be listed. The three or four most frequently mentioned topics under general headings appear below (for a full listing and their frequency of appearance, see Appendix H):

Effective Classroom Management

a. Time Management
b. Lesson Plan Development
c. Short/Long Range Planning

Discipline

a. Assertive Discipline
b. Behavior Modification
c. Cantor Classroom Discipline

Instructional Delivery Systems

a. Drill and Practice
b. Group Investigation
c. Teaching New Materials
d. Checking for Understanding

Curriculum

a. Subject Area Knowledge
b. Curriculum Integration
c. Evaluation of Student Learning

Instructional Processes

a. Learning Styles/Theory
b. Ability Range Adaptation/Teaching to Individual Needs
c. Student Motivation

Direct Instruction

a. Questioning/Discussion Strategies
b. Demonstration
c. Lecture

Indirect Instruction

a. Diagnostic Testing
b. Manipulatives/Games
c. Supplemental Instructional Materials

School Community Relations

a. Involving Parents in School and Student Development
b. Communicating Student Achievement/Problems
c. Developing Effective Home Education
d. Developing Parent Support Groups
e. Identifying and Using School-Business Partnerships

Professional Education

a. New Trends in Teaching Gifted/Handicapped
b. Conferencing Skills
c. School Climate Research
d. At-risk Students

Personal Needs

a. Coping with Stress
b. Career
c. Development of Leadership Skills

District/Building Information

a. Building Duties
b. Building Procedures
c. Contract
d. Job Benefits
e. Staff Evaluation

Inductee Training. Each district provides an orientation for its inductees; the scope and duration of the orientation varies widely, and written plans, with few exceptions, were quite vague in terms of when the orientation would occur and how much information would be presented. Five districts, for example, reported providing a two-day meeting for inductees prior to school opening, while three reported a one-day meeting. Others provided no information on this matter. Among the topics or activities most frequently identified for such orientations were the following (for a complete listing, see Appendix I):

a. Philosophy and structure of district

b. Meeting with support/mentor teachers

c. Fringe benefits, employee rights

d. Standard classroom procedures and school rules/duties

e. Building and employee handbooks

f. Completion of needs assessment questionnaire

g. Support services

h. Goals of induction program, induction team roles and the on-going logistics for the induction program

i. On-site visit to school assignment

Other districts offered lists of information that should be given to inductees but offered no indication when such information should be made available, other than sometimes specifying who should provide the information--principal, superintendent, mentor, etc. A few districts did have very detailed time-lines showing the activities for the year and the focus of various meetings. A review of the information to be provided and its presentation in the written plans suggests little rationale, however, for why certain topics are presented or the order in which they are presented. In fact, a number of the plans, although they had inductee needs assessment instruments, clearly had gone ahead and scheduled the topics they believed inductees would need to have help on without any indication that the results of the inductees' needs assessment would have an impact on their planning.

PDE (1990) asks districts to describe how they would include the research on effective teaching to cover the following topics:

a. Effective classroom management

b. Instructional delivery techniques

c. School/community relations

d. Professional communications

To determine how inductees perceived the effectiveness of their districts' efforts in providing information/training related to these areas and others, inductees were asked to indicate whether their districts' induction process addressed certain items. The topics were taken from the Schultz study (1988). See Table 6; percentages from the Schultz survey are included for comparison purposes.

Table 6

Topics Addressed by Districts' TIP

	Yes (N)	%	Schultz	No	%	Schultz
a. Instruction on effective use of instructional time	127	71	82%	50	28	18%
b. Instruction concerning effective use of physical space provided in classroom or work area	71	40	57%	106	59	43%
c. Background information concerning the school and students in the geographic area	150	84	66%	28	16	34%
d. Information/training in use of affirmative discipline techniques	129	72	78%	48	27	22%
e. Classroom techniques designed to accommodate the different learning styles of students	108	60	76%	68	38	24%
f. Information/training on identification of at-risk students, students with learning problems, disabilities and other special needs	103	58	55%	73	41	45%
g. Information/training on techniques to foster positive self-esteem in students and high expectations for each student	127	71	77%	49	27	23%
h. Information/training on alternative methods of classroom instruction techniques such as peer teaching, grouping, individualizing, student teams, etc.	110	61	69%	66	37	31%
i. Methods for involving the family in school activities	72	40	63%	104	58	37%
j. Information pertaining to cultural differences	43	24	35%	133	75	65%
k. Instruction on conducting professional conferences with parents	110	62	55%	66	37	45%
l. Methods for getting home and school jointly involved in students' academic life	99	55	54%	76	42	45%
m. Opportunities to discuss professional issues with peers on a regular basis	129	72	74%	45	25	26%
n. Provision of a professional library with up-to-date teaching literature methods, research, etc.	115	64	33%	60	33	67%
o. Opportunities to observe colleagues, including mentor, in teaching situations	127	72	50%	48	27	50%

Inductee/Mentor Relationships. An effective working relationship between inductee and mentor is essential to the success of any TIP. Studies suggest that for the relationship to be an effective one, inductee and mentor need time to work together, conference about concerns, observe each other's teaching (Newcombe, 1988). In terms of having released time for discussions with their mentors, 47 percent indicated such time was available while 51 percent indicated such time was not available. In Schultz's survey, 53 percent indicated time was available; 47 percent said it was not.

The variation in the frequency of such meetings in the rural districts is noticeable: 63 percent of the inductees met weekly with their mentors; 17 percent of the inductees met monthly; 6 percent met once a semester (15 weeks); 2 percent met once a year. This variation in frequency of contact between inductees and mentors is supported by the variation reflected in district plans and in reports from mentors.

Although 72 percent of the inductees reported having opportunities to observe peers in teaching situations, only 45 percent indicated that their mentor observed the inductees' teaching. Of those inductees reporting that their mentors observed their teaching, 29 percent indicated that their mentors rated their teaching, while 69 percent reported that no rating was done. These percentages parallel those found in the Schultz study.

Asked to rate the induction process in their district for its effectiveness in assisting them to become better teachers, 40 percent of the inductees gave the process a 4 or 5, while 55 percent ranked it at a 3 or lower on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest. See Table 7 below for specific distribution.

Table 7

Inductee Perception of
District TIP Effectiveness

No response	3 percent
1	9 percent
2	17 percent
3	29 percent
4	28 percent
5	12 percent

When asked to identify weaknesses of their districts' TIP, inductees' responses were startingly similar to those identified by mentors (see pages 22-24).

Time. Inductees consistently identified the lack of time as one of the primary weaknesses in their districts' TIP. Many inductees indicated that they seldom saw their mentors, that time for conferences, classroom observations, feedback sessions, etc., was at a premium. As a result, inductees felt frustrated that although there was supposedly a system to assist them, no provisions were made to insure that sufficient time was provided for the system to work. Inductees also commented on the incompatibility of mentor/inductee scheduling, the lack of physical proximity to their mentors, and the absence of adequate time for orientation. Most frequently mentioned, however, was that mentors did not spend time in inductees' classrooms observing and providing helpful feedback.

Mentor Training. A frequently mentioned concern was the lack of training for mentors. Although inductees were not specific in what elements of training were absent, there was a consensus that mentors were not always well prepared for

providing the kind of assistance and feedback that inductees needed. Inductees reported that mentors seemed not to be fully aware of what their responsibilities were and that guidelines for mentoring seemed vague. Inductees also suggested that there was not as much accountability required of mentors as might be expected. As a result, mentoring practices and commitment often were inconsistent or completely lacking.

Inservice. The picture of inservice for inductees was a blurred one. Inductees frequently cited the lack of information on district policies and procedures, the absence of attention to specific problem areas such as discipline and general classroom management strategies, the infrequency with which inservice was provided, and the absence of matching inductee needs with appropriate support.

Program Organization. From the comments of inductees, one gets a general picture of TIPs which are not particularly well organized. Inductees suggested that meetings were not always well planned nor contained appropriate content, that opportunities for mentors to meet as a group and inductees to meet as a group to discuss common concerns were missing, that the timelines were not realistic, and that follow-through was often weak. Inductees also suggested a lack of consistency in interpretation of a district's plan among schools in a district. Inductees reported feeling a sense of isolation, often commenting that they never saw or spoke with the district induction coordinator and that they seldom had contact with principals or superintendents in conjunction with the elements of the TIP.

In citing strengths of their districts' induction plans, however, inductee assessments centered on the support and the information which the plans provided. In those two categories, their comments paralleled those of their mentors.

Support. Inductees clearly felt that the TIP was a supportive program. Frequently cited as a strength was that the TIP took a good deal of the pressure off the beginning teacher, provided the inductee with a sense of belonging to a professional community and that it legitimized contact between inexperienced and experienced teachers. Inductees liked the way the program promoted interaction with other faculty as well as the mentor. Inductees reported feeling more comfortable in talking with other faculty about problems and that the program made them feel they belonged in the district.

Information. Inductees felt that they received useful information from their mentors and from the inservice efforts of their districts. They also cited feedback on their teaching as being a particularly valuable source of information which assisted them in becoming more effective teachers. Inductees also gave good marks to their induction programs for providing them with information about the school and community. Resources, such as a professional library, other teachers' materials, and district guidelines were cited as positive elements in the induction process.

In general, then, inductees expressed appreciation for the sense of support which their districts provided through the TIP, but over 50 percent of them indicated less than an overwhelming vote of confidence in the quality of the program, suggesting that districts might do well to spend some time assessing their plans and inviting more feedback from the people most directly affected by the program.

V. INDUCTION COORDINATORS' PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Just as inductees and mentors were asked to indicate the strengths and weaknesses of their districts' induction plans, induction coordinators had a similar opportunity. In identifying their programs' strengths, coordinators tended to look at program organization and mentoring.

Organization. Coordinators felt that their districts' plans were well organized and realistic in their expectations. Coordinators also saw as a strength that the program was cooperatively planned and that it provided flexibility to meet the needs of individuals. Job descriptions, depth of content, and orientation were some of the other positive elements.

Mentors. An essential ingredient to the success of a district's plan was the role of the mentor. Coordinators tended to feel that mentors, on the whole, did a good job and that mentor access and availability were positive factors. The interaction which occurs between mentor and inductee, according to coordinators, provides a real sense of district support to the new teacher.

When addressing the weaknesses of their districts' TIPs, coordinators tended to focus on constraints of time and on the mentoring process.

Time. Coordinators clearly felt, as did both mentors and inductees, that one of the principal elements causing district plans to be ineffective was the lack of time; this problem manifests itself in shortages of released time for mentors to observe inductees actually teaching, for conferencing, for allowing inductees to visit either the mentors' classrooms or peers to observe teaching styles and techniques. The lack of time for proper orientation and for carrying out inservice activities also was mentioned frequently.

Mentoring. Finding willing and capable mentors seemed to be a problem for a number of coordinators; factors cited related to this problem were small stipends, absence of released time, and the lack of interest among experienced teachers; accompanying this concern was the difficulty of providing an appropriate match between mentor and inductee in terms of corresponding levels of teaching assignment, scheduling, and physical proximity. Also cited with considerable frequency was the absence of any real training for mentors.

Organization. Although coordinators often cited their programs' organization as a strength, a number of them also suggested that lack of organization was a problem. Most frequently cited organizational problems were lack of formal inservice to meet the needs of mentors and inductees, absence of appropriate and consistent guidelines, absence of comprehensive evaluation, lack of separation between administrator and mentor evaluation, absence of appropriate timelines, and lack of mandated meetings and follow-up activities.

On the whole, induction coordinators were much more positive about their districts' plans than either of the populations directly affected by the plan. Sixty percent of the coordinators rated their district's TIP at a 4 or higher while 37 percent rated it at a 3 or lower.

VI. TIP EVALUATION, RECORD KEEPING AND RECOGNITION

Evaluation Plans

PDE guidelines call for each district to provide a description of the evaluation procedures to be used in assessing the effectiveness of their TIPs. The PDE also suggested that districts include a copy of the instrument used to evaluate the program. A review of the 29 written induction plans revealed that all districts had complied with the stipulation but with considerable variation in the specificity and comprehensiveness of the evaluation.

By far the preferred method of evaluation was to provide the several populations affected by the TIP with a relatively open-ended questionnaire which typically contained such questions as the following:

For Inductees:

a. Did this program provide the support you needed? Explain.

b. List ways in which the program may be improved.

c. Indicate the extent to which the following were achieved: (here would be a variety of topics such as parent/teacher communication, classroom management, instructional processes, etc.)

d. What was the most important/successful contribution made by your mentor?

e. Other comments

For Mentors:

a. Were the inservice activities for teacher induction completed?

b. What changes would you recommend for the program?

c. What advice would you offer to future mentors?

d. Other comments

For Principals/Administrators

a. What changes would you recommend for next year's plan?

b. Were induction program objectives met? To what extent?

c. Other comments

To these brief evaluations might be added mentor and inductee logs, individual evaluations of inservice workshops, professional growth plans, and the results of interviews. A number of plans also called for continuous assessment through the meetings of the induction councils, feedback from principals and mentors, etc.

Record Keeping and Recognition

All districts are required to keep records of inductee participation in the program, since inductees are required to have completed an approved induction program before they are granted permanent Pennsylvania certification. Superintendents are required to file PDE Form 4511 when each professional employee applies for such certification. District personnel offices usually are charged with keeping a record of induction completion. Inductees are supposed to receive

official recognition from the school district when they complete the district's induction program.

In addition to keeping on file the names of those teachers completing the induction process, a limited number of districts choose to provide more official means of recognition by holding a dinner or social function at which inductees and their mentors are recognized and presented with plaques or certificates indicating their successful completion of the program. Appropriate newspaper and other media coverage usually accompany the event.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISCUSSION

The following recommendations are based upon the data collected in this study. They are meant only to suggest key areas where school districts might want to direct their efforts to strengthen their induction plans.

1. MENTOR TRAINING SHOULD BE A KEY COMPONENT IN ANY INDUCTION PLAN AND DISTRICTS SHOULD SET ASIDE SUFFICIENT TIME FOR SUCH TRAINING TO TAKE PLACE.

Seventy-nine percent of the mentors responding in this study indicated that they had no training as mentors even though the PDE guidelines clearly state that mentors should be qualified by previous training or by receiving such training. Only 35 percent of the mentors had been lead teachers and only 8 percent held supervisory certificates. Those individuals who had been trained as lead teachers might well have received training which would prove helpful as a mentor, but it is clear that the majority of mentors probably receive little or no preparation for their role. District induction coordinators and inductees also cited the lack of mentor training as one of the major weaknesses in their districts' plans.

The assumption has often been made that if one is a successful teacher then correspondingly one should be a successful mentor. Bey (1990) suggests that this view is inappropriate in situations where mentoring has become a standardized and required practice. Informal mentoring has been in existence for years and has commonly existed in the form of experienced teachers passing on their knowledge and wisdom to new teachers. But the current emphasis on mentoring involves a greater responsibility, namely increasing the number of teachers retained in the profession and providing for new teacher improvement.

What should mentors know? Bey (1990) suggests the following five areas which form a significant knowledge base for mentor teachers:

A. The Mentoring Process (including concept and purpose of mentoring, roles and responsibilities of mentors; phases of mentoring relationships; needs of new teachers).

B. Clinical Supervision (including analysis of instruction, classroom visitations, observation techniques, and conferencing skills).

C. Coaching and Modeling (including effective instructional strategies; demonstration teaching; reinforcing teaching effectiveness; modifying instruction; maintaining professionalism).

D. Adult Development (including characteristics of adult learners; life cycle changes; stages of teacher development and growth; self reliance and motivation; stress management).

E. Interpersonal Skills (including communication skills, oral and written; problem solving techniques; decision-making skills; active listening skills; effective questioning skills).

When queried in a follow-up survey (see Appendix M) regarding what they perceived as being the key areas for training, induction coordinators, reporting

on their mentors' preferences, identified the following priorities in order of preference:

1. Coaching and Modeling
2. Mentoring Processes
3. Interpersonal Skills
4. Clinical Supervision
5. Adult Development

Although the length of time required for the most effective training may well vary from district to district, it is clear from the data that at present both the time being devoted to training and the knowledge being presented are inadequate. Districts need to devise ways to develop training programs which reflect the basic knowledge base for mentoring. (See especially Driscoll, Peterson and Kauchak, 1985; Thies-Sprinthall, 1986; Shulman and Colbert, 1987, 1988; also, Far West Laboratory, 1988; and Newcombe, 1990 for sample training materials and models). The constraints in rural districts for training--time, staff, professional resources--would indicate that such districts might well explore the use of regional training programs or model programs sponsored by intermediate units; districts might also consider adding to their requirements of mentors the stipulation that mentors must have been trained as teacher leaders, thus reducing significantly the need for a separate formal training program.

2. TIME MUST BE FOUND WITHIN THE REGULAR CONSTRAINTS OF THE TEACHING DAY FOR MENTORS AND INDUCTEES TO WORK TOGETHER.

Forty-three percent of the mentors report no direct classroom observation of their inductees and 64 percent of the mentors receive no released time for conferences with their inductees. Only 45 percent of the inductees report having their mentors observe their classroom teaching and over 50 percent of the inductees report that released time for conferences with mentors is not

available. These findings contradict, to some extent, districts' written plans which provide guidelines for the amount of interaction between mentors and inductees (see pages 18-19). Since the basic assumption of mentoring is that considerable interaction occurs between mentor and inductee both in and outside of the classroom, these findings suggest that true mentoring in many rural districts may well be non-existent.

If the written plans of districts regarding the amount of interaction between mentors and inductees and the actual time devoted to such meetings are to match, districts, and more specifically, individual schools need to look at ways this can be accomplished. Among the options which might be explored are the following:

A. Actual released time for mentor; a mentor might serve two or three inductees if such time were available

B. Principals, assistant principals or other qualified district staff assuming responsibility for the mentor's classes to permit the mentor to visit the inductee's classes

C. Common planning periods for mentors and inductees

D. Team teaching situations in which mentor and inductee can work together; common scheduling and physical proximity are factors in making this approach work

3. CLOSER ATTENTION NEEDS TO BE PAID TO THE DESIGN AND USE OF THE INDUCTEE NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND THE DESIGN OF A PROGRAM'S FINAL EVALUATION IN DISTRICTS.

PDE guidelines call for the presence of a needs assessment in each district's induction plan. Although such assessments appear in district plans, the actual use of the assessments in the induction process is less clear. Some

district plans suggest that they use the same needs assessment for all staff development in their districts as they use with inductees.

The content and design of the needs assessment from district to district seem to vary and the follow-up use of the information gained from the assessment often is unclear. In many cases, although a needs assessment exists, it appears that decisions have already been made about what an inductee will need prior to his or her filling out the instrument. In general, districts' written plans were very vague on what use, if any, was made of the information from the needs assessment, and in some cases it was quite unclear as to what action might be taken if an inductee provided a certain kind of response to an assessment item.

Districts need to do a longitudinal study to determine how effective their assessment instruments are in pinpointing the needs of inductees. By collecting data over several years from the needs assessment, doing follow-up interviews with inductees after a year or more in the district (a few districts now do the latter), and interviews with mentors, information could be gathered that might lead to further refinement of the design, content, and use of a district's need assessment instrument. Certainly such practices would help a district to document the appropriateness of its assessment.

PDE also asks districts to provide in their written plans a description of how they will carry out an evaluation of their induction program. Most typically such evaluation seems to be in the form of open-ended surveys and the keeping of mentor and/or inductee logs. A few districts do a follow-up of inductees after they have been in the district more than one year to determine if, indeed, the program has had a desirable effect. For the most part, however, district written plans do not indicate any systematic in-depth evaluation which could yield useful information that might serve as the basis for further strengthening of the induction program. Such efforts might focus on the following:

1. Asking inductees to respond specifically at the end of the year to how well the needs they identified at the beginning of the year in the district's assessment were met rather than leaving this to chance as now appears to be the case
2. Asking inductees to rate the effectiveness of the instruction/support that they received through a variety of district initiatives
3. Asking mentors to provide the same kind of information
4. Doing a content analysis of mentor and inductee journals to identify common topics, concerns, issues, etc., and then incorporating the findings into review of the induction program
5. Conducting a follow-up interview of inductees after their second year and third year of employment in a district and incorporating findings into review of the induction program

4 DISTRICTS SHOULD DEVELOP SPECIFIC GUIDELINES IN THEIR WRITTEN INDUCTION PLANS FOR MEETING THE NEEDS OF EXPERIENCED TEACHERS NEW TO A DISTRICT AS WELL AS THE NEEDS OF SPECIALIZED TEACHER POPULATIONS.

Although PDE provides no specific guidelines on what districts should do to meet the needs of experienced teachers new to a district, a common theme among responses from mentors and inductees was that district plans lacked flexibility in dealing with such cases. Twenty-seven percent of the inductees indicated that they possessed one or more years of teaching experience prior to their employment in a district where they were treated as inductees. District plans, for the most part, did not provide any substantive guidelines on how this population was to be treated although mention of waiver of the induction requirements, either in whole or part, was indicated as a possibility in a limited number of plans.

Mentors, in particular, cited the difficulty of using district induction guidelines with these teachers as well as with employees in such areas as counseling, music, art, physical education. Consistently mentors reported that district materials and inservice did not seem to reflect the needs of inductees in these areas.

Districts should re-examine their induction plans in light of these findings and take steps, if necessary, to provide more flexibility to meet the needs of special populations. In addition, clear policy and procedures should be established concerning how waivers for all or parts of a district's induction plan may be obtained and a follow-up evaluation be conducted to determine if the waiver policy is effective.

5. HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN DISTRICT INDUCTION PROGRAMS.

The PDE guidelines suggest that representatives from higher education can be involved in a district's induction plan; only 2 districts written plans indicated that a representative from higher education was part of the district's program. At a time when more and more attention is being given to the quality of teacher preparation, the absence of such representation is disturbing. Although districts have the ultimate responsibility for providing induction support, higher education representation can play an important role in contributing to changes in teacher preparation programs.

A variety of models exist which suggest ways that higher education can be involved in teacher induction. "Guarantee programs" exist, for example in some states. A teacher preparation program guarantees the performance of its graduates and pledges to provide resources and support for any graduate who does not perform satisfactorily. In other plans, representatives from higher

education work with local districts as part of instructional support teams for beginning teachers (Duke, 1988).

Teacher education programs need the kind of feedback on the performance of their graduates which involvement in district induction programs can provide. At the very least, a representative from a higher education teacher preparation program should be a member of a district's induction council and, if possible, more direct involvement at the building level should be sought as well. In this way, districts and higher education can engage in useful dialogue about the preparation of teachers.

6. IMPROVEMENT IN COMMUNICATION WITH ALL PARTIES INVOLVED IN DISTRICTS' INDUCTION PROGRAM IS NEEDED.

Although in general, mentors and inductees were somewhat favorably disposed toward their districts' induction efforts, both populations saw considerable room for improvement. Frequently cited in the responses of mentors and inductees, and to a lesser extent in the responses of induction coordinators, was the apparent absence of clear program organization, consistency in time-lines, follow-up, design of activities, orientation meetings, etc.

Among the most often cited weaknesses by mentors was the absence of follow-up in terms of periodic meetings with them concerning their roles, adjustments in expectations, etc. Mentors also cited dissatisfaction with the materials supplied to them; often the materials were not current, others were unnecessarily lengthy, often not well written, and not infrequently inappropriate for the intended audience. Frequent comment was also made regarding the proliferation of forms and the lack of clear instruction about their use.

Inductees' perceptions of weaknesses centered on lack of organization and the vagueness of district policy and procedures regarding induction. Inductees

cited as examples meetings which were not well planned or which did not contain appropriate content, lack of communication and sharing among inductees within a district, inconsistency of interpretation of a district's plan from school to school within a district, and absence of communication and contact with induction coordinators, principals and superintendents regarding districts' TIP.

Some of the concerns expressed by mentors and inductees may be attributable to the relative newness of the induction process in most districts. All districts are presently engaged in reviewing their plans and submitting revisions to PDE for the next two-year cycle; as they prepare their revisions, districts would appear to need to focus more closely on how they communicate their expectations to both mentors and inductees and to provide greater opportunities for both populations to have continual feedback on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the program.

SUMMARY

The induction programs in Pennsylvania rural districts are clearly providing support for beginning teachers. This report has been an attempt to provide a view of the present status of rural induction programs in Pennsylvania. Although certain elements of the programs seem to be operating well, improvements should be made in the areas of mentor training, inductee/mentor relationships, particularly in terms of time for classroom observation and conferencing, flexibility to accommodate the needs of both experienced as well as inexperienced teachers, and better communication among all groups involved in induction.

It is hoped that the data and recommendations supplied by this report will assist rural districts as they continue to refine what has become a vital part of teacher retention and professional growth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bey, T. M. and Holmes, C.T. (Eds.). (1990). Mentoring: Developing Successful New Teachers. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Carracciolo, K.A. (1989). An investigation of Pennsylvania's induction programs. Unpublished paper.

Duke, C.R. (1988). The Mellon Teacher Effectiveness Report. Logan, UT: Department of Secondary Education, Utah State University. Unpublished.

Hawk, P. and Robards, S. (1987). Statewide teacher induction programs. In D. M. Brooks (Ed). Teacher Induction: A New Beginning (pp. 33-44). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators (ERIC 279 607).

Far West Laboratory. (1988). Preparing Mentors for Work with Beginning Teachers. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

Huling-Austin, L. (Ed.) (1986). Directory of teacher induction programs (Report No. 7216). Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, and the ATE Commission on the Induction Process.

Huling-Austin, L. (1989). Beginning assistance programs: An overview. In L. Huling-Austin and others (Eds). Assisting the Beginning Teacher (pp. 1-18). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Moyer, K.L. (1988). Pennsylvania's Rural Counties and the State System of Higher Education: A Review of Demographics. Harrisburg, PA: State System of Higher Education.

Newcombe, E. (1988). Mentoring Programs for New Teachers. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools.

Newcombe, E. (1990). Perspectives on Teacher Induction: A Review of the Literature and Promising Program Models. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Odell, S.J. (1990). Support for new teachers. In T. Bey and C.T. Holmes (Eds.). Mentoring: Developing Successful Teachers (pp. 3-23). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. (1987). Guidelines for Induction. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. (1990). Guidelines for Developing and Implementing Teacher Induction Programs. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Pesek, J. (1990). A study of the recruitment and retention of teachers in rural school districts in Pennsylvania. Clarion, PA: Clarion University. Unpublished paper.

Schultz, J. J. (1988). Teacher Induction Survey for First-Year Teaching Assignments 1987-88. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Professional Standards and Practices Commission.

Shulman, J.H. and Colbert, J.A. (Eds.). (1987). The Mentor Teacher Casebook. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Shulman, J.H. and Colbert, J.A. (Eds.). (1988). The Intern Teacher Casebook. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1986). A collaborative approach for mentoring training: A working model. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (6), 13-20.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: PARTICIPATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

DISTRICT	COUNTY
Allegheny Clarion Valley	Clarion
Bedford Area	Bedford
Bradford Area	McKean
Brockway Area	Jefferson
Brookville Area	Jefferson
Cameron County	Cameron
Canton Area	Bradford
Carmichaels Area	Greene
Central Greene	Greene
Chestnut Ridge	Bedford
Clarion Area	Clarion
Clarion Limestone Area	Clarion
Coudersport Area	Potter
Curwensville Area	Clearfield
Delaware Valley	Pike
DuBois Area	Clearfield
Forest Area	Forest
Glendale	Clearfield
Huntingdon Area	Huntingdon
Jefferson Morgan	Greene
Kane Area	McKean
Keystone	Clarion
Mountain View Area	Huntingdon
Northeast Bradford	Bradford
Northern Tioga	Tioga
Oil City Area	Venango
Oswayo Valley	Potter
Port Allegany	McKean
Redbank Valley	Clarion
Reynolds	Mercer
Smethport Area	McKean
St. Marys Area	Elk
Titusville Area	Venango
Union	Clarion
Valley Grove	Venango
Warren County	Warren
Wellsboro Area	Tioga
West Branch Area	Clearfield
West Perry	Perry

APPENDIX B: PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN A RURAL INDUCTION PLAN

Frequency	Responsibility
15	Orient inductee to building level management functions and support services
9	Participate in support teacher selection and training while carrying out regular duties
9	Update superintendent and/or induction coordinator of program progress throughout year
8	Implement induction program elements within building
6	Monitor mentor-inductee relationships
6	Participate in training sessions(s) with coordinator to discuss induction program and training model for support teachers
5	Orient building faculty to induction program
5	Suggest changes in program when appropriate
4	Provide release time for mentor to observe inductees
4	Serve as information conduit to support teachers for district written policies and procedures
3	Attend meetings called by coordinator and/or superintendent to determine progress and discuss any problems in program
3	Conduct individual/group consultations with support teachers on as-needed basis
3	Maintain induction project log
3	Meet regularly with inductees and support teachers
3	Provide release time for inductee to observe classes
1	Assist mentor teachers with designing professional growth plans to meet inductee needs
1	Cover classes for mentor teachers to allow them to observe inductees in regular teaching activity
1	Meet bi-weekly with each inductee for at least 30 minutes

APPENDIX C: RURAL MENTOR CHARACTERISTICS

Frequency	Characteristic
29	Chosen by Superintendent
19	Recognized by peers as excellent teacher
18	Voluntary participation in program
17	Holds tenure
15	Possesses Instructional II Certificate
14	Exhibits enthusiasm and positive attitude
13	Possesses good organizational skills
12	Has appropriate teaching assignment (grade, subject, level)
12	Possesses good classroom management skills
8	Works well with students and adults
7	Committed to teaching approved curriculum
7	Exhibits skills in both small and large group activities
5	Has excellent recommendations from principal
5	Located in same building as inductee if possible
4	Completed three years of successful teaching
3	Demonstrates flexibility and sensitivity to working with both students and staff
2	Completed five years within district
2	Completed three years of successful teaching, 2 of which must be in district
2	Completed three years of successful teaching, 1 of which must be in district
2	Has ability to maintain confidentiality
1	Completed three years of teaching in district
1	Completed two years of successful teaching experience
1	Demonstrates ability to react in a fair and equitable manner, suspending peremptory judgments
1	Maintains satisfactory relationship with induction coordinator

APPENDIX D: RURAL MENTOR TRAINING TOPICS

Frequency	Topic
7	Classroom management
6	Effective teaching strategies
6	Philosophy of district and/or school
5	Knowledge of curriculum
4	Communication skills
4	Concerns of new teachers
4	Conferencing skills
4	Effective teaching components
3	Purpose of induction program
2	Grading, record keeping, attendance, scheduling, etc.
2	Parent/teacher handbook
2	Problem solving and decision-making skills
2	Public relations skills
1	Employee handbook
1	Knowledge of adult learner

APPENDIX E: LISTING OF RURAL MENTOR RESPONSIBILITIES

Frequency	Responsibility
19	Holds meeting with inductee
17	Establishes a positive, professional rapport with assigned inductee
17	Serves as resource person on all inservice topics within realm of expertise
14	Formally meets with inductees before, after, or during school to discuss induction related topics
14	Participates in training session(s) with district coordinators to discuss induction plan goals and activities
13	Observes inductees teaching in their regular classroom setting
12	Keeps a log of all meetings
12	Participates in evaluation of induction program and makes suggestions for improvements
12	Serves as a role model and professional support person to help inductees in all aspects of adjustment to their new teaching positions
11	Arranges classroom observations for inductee to observe other teachers, including mentor
11	Assists in development of individualized induction plan with inductee based on self assessment results
6	Monitors inductee progress and guides him or her toward attainment of induction goals
5	Seeks aid of supervisor if serious conflicts arise between mentor and inductee
4	Develops and conducts one-on-one inservice training sessions on topics identified in individualized induction plans
2	Acts as liaison with induction team
2	Arranges visits between peer-inductees
2	Calls induction team meetings as necessary
2	Updates the induction coordinators on induction activities throughout the school year
1	Covers inductee's class to free inductee for observation
1	Demonstrates lessons for inductee
1	Develops skills as a mentor as well as a teacher
1	Learns to apply modified clinical-type classroom observation system with inductees
1	Sees that two inductee-taught classes are videotaped, one with inductee having prior knowledge of taping, second without such knowledge; reviews results with inductee

APPENDIX F: RURAL INDUCTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

Frequency	Responsibility
20	Meet on regularly scheduled basis with mentor teacher and/or support administrator
18	Participate in training session with coordinators to discuss induction plan goals and activities
17	Keep journal or log detailing experiences during induction year
16	Participate in group and individual inservice training sessions focusing on areas of emphasis taken from needs assessment
13	Evaluate induction program experience and make suggestions for improvement
8	Complete induction process successfully
8	Establish positive working relationship with mentor
8	Visit other classrooms within subject area to observe other teaching techniques and programs
6	Be responsive to suggestions for improvement
5	Complete needs assessment instrument at initial orientation meeting (one district had this done three times a year)
5	Seek aid of principal if serious conflict arises between themselves and their support teacher
4	Develop an individualized induction plan jointly with mentor teacher
4	Develop internal feeling of loyalty to school district and to feel good about teaching
4	Work toward attainment of goals indentified in plan
2	Be aware of and conform to district policies and procedures
1	Be aware of and conform to state and federal guidelines
1	Submit copies of weekly lesson plans to mentor, department head and building principal

APPENDIX G: ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

ORIENTATION TO RESEARCH-BASED INSTRUCTION OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING

TRUE/FALSE

CLASSROOM - TIME ON TASK

Engaged time on task in the early grades has no long-lasting effect upon student learning of basic skills. _____

The step-by-step method in seatwork assignments produces greater student involvement than does a random-choice approach, determined by the student himself/herself. _____

Off-task time is reduced through the use of teacher-structured transitions from one lesson to another. _____

Student achievement is related directly to a reduced number of study periods. _____

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

It is not necessary to hold students accountable for completing all assigned work within the specified timeframe, but tests should be checked frequently. _____

A decentralized seating/desk pattern provides for the optimum learning atmosphere in the classroom. _____

Formal, classroom procedures should be established after the students have become acclimated to the classroom and the teacher, during the first week or two of school. _____

The discovery methods works best in developing the skills necessary to perform school work, e.g., locate an assignment. _____

EXPECTATIONS

Higher levels of achievement are the result of non-direct questioning during classroom discussions. _____

Students will conform with teacher expectations. _____

Students achieve better in a no-nonsense, business-like atmosphere where the emphasis is on academics. _____

Effective teachers treat all students alike, regardless of their cultural backgrounds. _____

INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY

The direct instruction model is appropriate for all types of students and all curricular areas. _____

Time-on-task is increased through the utilization of small group and individualized instruction. _____

Inclass study periods produce positive results in the achievement of students. _____

Effective teachers should select and direct all classroom activities. _____

DIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

Individualized, discovery learning approaches to learning produce higher levels of achievement than when structured lessons are used by the teacher. _____

Lectures and demonstrations should be used in the effective classrooms. _____

Drill, recitation, and practice activities do not have a valid place in an effective classroom. _____

Individualized instruction produces realistic expectations in the early grades when students manage their own learning situations. _____

EFFECTIVE TEACHING OF MATHEMATICS

A relaxed atmosphere is conducive to increased learning in mathematics in the elementary grades. _____

More time should be spent by students in repetitive, individual seatwork at the secondary level. _____

WHOLE CLASS SYSTEM/MATHEMATICS

Homework should not exceed fifteen minutes at the intermediate level in the elementary school. _____

A weekly maintenance review is important at the junior high school level. _____

EFFECTIVE TEACHING OF READING

Workbooks and skill sheets produce higher achievement levels than do similar time spans spent on independent reading and individual writing assignments. _____

Ability grouping in reading may impede the learning of the slow learner rather than help the student. _____

EFFECTIVE CLASSROOMS FOR LOW ACHIEVERS

Effective teachers spend more time with seatwork-type activities for remedial students. _____

In dealing with remedial students it must be realized that much of their problem rests with the home rather than with the classroom. _____

Effective teachers are active teachers, using the direct instruction model. _____

TEACHER/CLASSROOM VARIABLES

Continuing teacher education has a direct, positive influence on student achievement. _____

Teacher certification has a direct correlation with student achievement. _____

APPENDIX H: RURAL DISTRICTS' NEEDS ASSESSMENT TOPICS

Effective Classroom Management

13	Time Management
12	Lesson Plan Development
8	Short/Long Range Planning
7	Test Score Interpretation
7	Monitoring Student Progress
6	Referral Procedures
5	Attendance Reports
5	Grouping Techniques
5	Record Keeping
5	Student Grading/Evaluation
5	Wait Time
4	Requisitioning
4	Scheduling
4	Setting up Plan Book
1	Classroom Atmosphere
1	Clerical Duties
1	First Day Planning
1	Mainstreaming

Discipline

6	Assertive Discipline
6	Behavior Modification
6	Cantor Classroom Discipline
5	Conflict Management
5	Reinforcement Theory
5	Student Discipline
4	Classroom Rules
4	Lesson Transition
4	Student Reward System
1	Corporal Punishment
1	Preventive Discipline
1	Legal Aspects of Discipline

Instructional Delivery Systems

6	Drill and Practice
6	Group Investigation
5	Teaching New Materials
5	Checking for Understanding
5	Discovery Learning
5	Remediation
5	Simulation
4	Listening Skills Development
1	Cooperative Learning

Curriculum

17	Subject Area Knowledge
11	Curriculum Integration
10	Evaluation of Student Learning
7	Planned Courses
6	Thinking Skills
5	Homework
5	State Regulations/District Requirements
4	I.E.P. Development/Review
3	Curriculum Management
3	Independent Study Projects
3	Task Analysis
3	Team Teaching
2	Developmental Reading Skills
1	Curriculum Mapping
1	Physical Fitness
1	Problem Solving
1	Textbook Selection and Adoption
1	Writing Across the Curriculum

Instructional Processes

14	Learning Styles/Theory
12	Ability Range Adaptation/Teaching to Individual Needs
11	Student Motivation
9	Elements of Effective Instruction
9	Test Building/Item Writing
7	Child Development
6	Behavior Modeling
6	Lesson Presentation
5	Material Selection
4	Developing Objectives
3	Models of Teaching
1	Improving Use of Technology (computers) in Teaching and Administrative Tasks

Direct Instruction

7	Questioning/Discussion Strategies
5	Demonstration
5	Lecture

Indirect Instruction

7	Diagnostic Testing
6	Manipulatives/Games
6	Supplemental Instructional Materials

School Community Relations

10	Involving Parents in School and Student Development
7	Communicating Student Achievement/Problems
7	Developing Effective Home Education
7	Developing Parent Support Groups
7	Identifying and Using School-Business Partnerships
6	Communicating Expectations to Parents
6	Managing Conflict with Parents
5	Improving Image of Education/School in Community
2	Improving School Morale and Climate
2	Knowing Community/School Culture
1	Assisting with Stress Reduction for Parents and Children
1	Promoting Effective Nutrition and Eating Habits for Students and Parents
1	Recognition and Accommodation of Economic and Cultural Differences Among Students, Parents and Staff

Professional Education

9	New Trends in Teaching Gifted/Handicapped
7	Conferencing Skills
7	School Climate Research
6	At-risk Students
6	Child Abuse Intervention
6	Tenure/Certification Issues
5	AIDS Policies for Staff and Students
5	Computer Programming
5	Effects of Medication on Behavior and Learning
5	Peer Classroom Visitation
5	Software Evaluation
4	Educational Data Bases
4	Effective Schools Research
4	Handicapped Research Issues
4	State/Federal Special Education Laws
3	Communication Among Special Education Programs
3	Due Process Hearings
3	Written Communication Skills
2	School Law
2	Use of Audiovisual Equipment
2	Writing/Obtaining Mini-grants
1	Adolescent Development
1	Benefits of Professional Organization Membership
1	Bloom's Taxonomy
1	Brain Research
1	Computer Assisted Instruction
1	Drugs and Alcohol Program/Prevention
1	Health Services
1	Learning Centers
1	Open Space School
1	Peer Coaching
1	Program Dissemination from Local Universities/Colleges

1	Recognition of Substance Abuse Problems
1	Roles of Classroom Aides
1	School District Policies
1	Sexuality Awareness
1	Student Assistance Programs
1	Suicide Programs/Prevention
1	Teenage Pregnancy Programs/Prevention

Personal Needs

4	Coping with Stress
3	Career
3	Development of Leadership Skills
3	Development of Long Range Plans for Professional Career
3	Interpersonal Relationships
2	Developing Professionalism
2	Writing Skills
1	Active Listening Skills
1	Building
1	Improvement of Life Planning Skills
1	Managing Conflict
1	Modeling Instructional Techniques
1	Observational Techniques
1	Organizing and Conducting Effective Meetings
1	Sharing of Professional Activities
1	Supervising and Working with Staff
1	Wellness

District/Building Information

7	Building Duties
7	Building Procedures
6	Contract
6	Job Benefits
6	Staff Evaluation
5	Board Policies/Procedures
5	Field Trips
5	Procedures/Forms for Sick Days, Leaves of Absence, Personal Days
5	School Calendar
1	Computer Services
1	District Philosophy and Mission
1	Extracurricular Activities
1	Federal and State Programs (Chapters 1 and 2, TELS)
1	Legal Rights and Liabilities of Teachers
1	Library/Media Services
1	Promotion/Retention Procedures/Policies
1	Pupil Services
1	Special Education Referral Service
1	Teacher Induction Program

APPENDIX I: ORIENTATION TOPICS FOR RURAL INDUCTEES

Frequency	Topic
15	Philosophy and structure of district
14	Meeting with support/mentor teachers
13	Fringe benefits, employee rights
10	Standard classroom procedures and school rules/duties
9	Building handbooks
9	Completion of needs assessment questionnaire
9	Employee handbook
9	Support services
8	Goals of induction program
8	Induction team roles
8	On-going logistics for induction program
8	On-site visit to school assignment
7	Discipline policies
7	Meet with building principal
7	School/community relationships
6	Curriculum development
6	Evaluation process
6	Grading policies
4	Certification requirements
4	Parent/student handbook
3	Federal and state guidelines
3	Information regarding teachers' association
3	Testing program
2	Expectations of building principal
2	Fundamentals of effective instruction
2	Peer relationships
1	Conferencing techniques
1	Current research in education
1	Special programs

APPENDIX J

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDUCTION COORDINATORS

School District: _____

Your Official Administrative Title: _____

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE RECORD YOUR RESPONSES ON THE ANSWER SHEET PROVIDED; PROVIDE WRITTEN COMMENTS ONLY WHERE REQUESTED. RETURN THIS SURVEY AND THE ANSWER SHEET CLIPPED TOGETHER. MANY THANKS FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

1. What is the student enrollment in your district?

   A. 600-1,000 B. 1,001-1,400 C. 1,401-1,800
   D. more than 1,800

2. How many full-time teachers are employed in your district?

   A. 100-150 B. 151-200 C. 201-250 D. 251-300
   E. more than 300

3. What is your number of inductees for 1988-90?

   A. 1-2 B. 3-5 C. 6-8 D. 9-12 E. more than 12

4. How many trained mentors are available in your district?

   A. 5-10 B. 11-15 C. 16-24 D. 25-30 E. more than 30

5. Please indicate your gender

   A. male B. female

6. Please indicate your age

   A. under 25 B. 26-35 C. 36-45 D. over 45

7. Please use the following racial/ethnic categories to identify ethnicity:

   A. ___ American Indian or Alaskan Native - all persons having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintain cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

   B. ___ Asian or Pacific Islander - all persons having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for examples, China, Japan Korea, India, the Philippine Islands and Samoa.

C. ___ Black, Not of Hispanic Origin - all persons having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

D. ___ Hispanic - all persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

E. ___ White, Not of Hispanic Origin - all persons having origins in the original peoples of Europe, North Africa or the Middle East.

8. What is your level of education?

A. Bachelor's degree B. Master's degree C. Beyond Master's

9. How long have you served as your district's induction coordinator?

A. 1 year or less B. 2 years C. 3 years D. more than 3 years

10. Are you provided released time to serve as induction coordinator?

A. yes B. no, considered part of my regular job responsibility

11. What is the estimated dollar cost of your induction program this year?

A. 0-100 B. 101-500 C. 501-1,000 D. 1,001-1,500
E. Above 1,500

12. How are your mentor teachers selected?

A. volunteers B. teacher organizations C. by administrators
D. other

13. How much released time do mentor teachers receive to spend working in the induction program?

A. 100% B. 75% C. 50% D. 25% E. no release time

14. Do your mentor teachers receive stipends?

A. Yes B. No

15. Are your inductees compensated with any of the following:

A. stipend B. released time C. combination of A and B;
D. none

16. Do you provide training for your mentor teachers?

A. Yes B. No

17. Have you consulted with any university teacher preparation programs in the design, implementation or evaluation of your induction program?

    A. Yes B. No

18. Do you have a systematic evaluation of your induction program?

    A. Yes B. No

19. If yes, who carries out the evaluation?

    A. induction coordinator B. mentor teacher(s) C. inductees
    D. all three E. other

20. Does your central office keep records of all inductees who have successfully completed the induction process?

    A. Yes B. No

21. How many inductees can be assigned to one mentor?

    A. 1 B. 2 C. 3 D. 4 E. 5 or more

22. How many years of teaching experience in your district must a mentor teacher have?

    A. 1-2 B. 3-4 C. 5-6 D. more than 6

23. Are mentors and inductees paired by grade levels and/or content backgrounds?

    A. Yes B. No

24. Are mentor observations used in the district evaluation of the inductee?

    A. Yes B. No

25. How often are mentors expected to meet with inductees to discuss their progress, provide information, etc.

    A. weekly B. monthly C. once a quarter (6 weeks)
    D. once a semester (15 weeks) E. as needed

26. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest score, how would you rate the induction process in terms of effectiveness for new teachers this year?

    A. 1 B. 2 C. 3 D. 4 E. 5

27. Would you like a copy of the results of this study?

    A. Yes B. No

28. Are you willing to discuss your program in more detail in a personal interview or group discussion?

    A. Yes B. No

29. Briefly list what you would consider to be the three (3) major strengths of your current induction program:

30. Briefly list what you would consider to be the three (3) major weaknesses of your current induction program:

31. If you have other comments you would like to make about the mandated induction process in Pennsylvania or more specifically your district, please feel free to respond in the space below.

APPENDIX K

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MENTOR TEACHERS

School District: _____

Directions: Please use the enclosed answer sheet to record your responses; provide written comments only where requested.

1. Please indicate gender.

   A. Male B. Female

2. Please indicate age range.

   A. 24-30 B. 31-46 C. 47-53 D. 54-58 E. 59+

3. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

   A. 1-5 B. 6-8 C. 9-12 D. Over 12

4. What is your level of education?

   A. Bachelor's degree B. Master's Degree C. Beyond Master's

5. Please use the following racial/ethnic categories to identify ethnicity:

   A. ____ American Indian or Alaskan Native - all persons having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintain cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

   B. ____ Asian or Pacific Islander - all persons having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, Japan, Korea, India, the Philippine Islands and Samoa.

   C. ____ Black, Not of Hispanic Origin - all persons having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

   D. ____ Hispanic - all persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

   E. ____ White, Not of Hispanic Origin - all persons having origins in the original peoples of Europe, North Africa or the Middle East.

6. Are you currently a classroom teacher?

   A. Yes B. No

7. I now _____ in my district.

   A. Teach full-time B. Teach part-time C. Am Full-time Mentor

8. What level do you teach?

   A. K-3 B. 1-6 C. 7-12

9. Approximately how many teachers are employed in your school district?

   A. Less than 100 B. 101 - 500 C. 501 - 1000

10. Approximately how many teachers are in your school?

    A. 1 - 15 B. 16 - 30 C. 31 - 40 D. More than 40

11. Have you ever been a department head or lead teacher?

    A. Yes B. No

12. Do you hold a supervisory or administrative certificate?

    A. Yes B. No

13. How were you chosen to be a mentor teacher?

    A. Objective test B. By administration C. By peers
    D. Volunteer

14. How much has your teaching schedule been reduced so you may serve as a mentor?

    A. 0-25% B. 26-50% C. 51-75% D. 76-100%

15. With how many inductees are you currently working?

    A. 1 B. 2-3 C. 4-5 D. 6-7 5. More than 7

16. Do you feel that mentor teachers need special training or courses other than those required for regular teacher certification?

    A. Yes B. No

17. When was the last time you took a college level course for academic credit?

    A. This year B. 1-2 years ago C. 3-4 years ago
    D. More than 4 years ago

18. Did you receive special training to be a mentor teacher?

    A. Yes B. No

19. If you received training, how useful did it prove to be?

A. Not useful B. Somewhat useful C. Useful
D. Very useful

20. Are you certified in the same area(s) as the inductee(s) with whom you serve as a mentor teacher?

A. Yes B. No C. Some

21. Does your district/school provide you with released time for conferences and observations with your inductees?

A. Yes B. No

22. Which of the following do you receive for compensation as a mentor teacher?

A. Extra money B. Released time C. No compensation

23. As a mentor how do you perceive your position?

A. Supervisor B. Peer coach C. Evaluator

24. Do you conduct regular observations of your inductee(s)?

A. Yes B. No

25. If you do observations, do you share the results with administration?

A. Yes B. No

26. As a mentor did you observe your inductee's teaching techniques on several lessons and offer any type of constructive criticism?

A. Yes B. No

27. How often were you able to meet with your inductee(s) during the year to conference about their progress?

A. Weekly B. Monthly C. Once a quarter D. Once a semester
E. Once a year

28. How would you describe your relationship with your inductee(s)?

A. Formal B. Professionally supportive C. Informal

29. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, how would you rate the induction process in terms of its effectiveness for inductees at your school.

A. 1 B. 2 C. 3 D. 4 E. 5

30. Would you serve as a mentor teacher again?

A. Yes B. No

II. **Overall Response** (Please write your responses to the following questions directly on this sheet in the space provided.)

31. What information/training did you as mentor directly provide your inductees (check as many as apply).

_____ A. Classroom management techniques
_____ B. District resources - library, professional materials, audio-visual
_____ C. Information about district policies, student population, etc.
_____ D. Parent/teacher conferences
_____ E. Instructional approaches to accommodate varied learning styles of students
_____ F. Other (please list)

32. Briefly list what you would consider to be the three major strengths or advantages of the induction process in your district.

33. Briefly list what you would consider the three major weaknesses of the induction process as you have experienced it.

APPENDIX L

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDUCTEES

School District: _____

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE USE THE ENCLOSED ANSWER SHEET TO RECORD YOUR RESPONSES; PROVIDE WRITTEN COMMENTS ONLY WHERE REQUESTED. RETURN THIS SURVEY AND THE ANSWER SHEET CLIPPED TOGETHER TO YOUR DISTRICT INDUCTION COORDINATOR BY

1. Please indicate your gender

   A. Male B. Female

2. Please indicate your age

   A. Under 25 B. 26-35 C. 36-45 D. Over 45

3. Please identify in which of the following racial/ethnic categories you belong

   A. ___ American Indian or Alaskan Native - all persons having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintain cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

   B. ___ Asian or Pacific Islander - all persons having origins in any of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, Japan, Korea, India, the Philippine Islands and Samoa.

   C. ___ Black, Not of Hispanic Origin - all persons having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

   D. ___ Hispanic - all persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

   E. ___ White, Not of Hispanic Origin - all persons having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa or the Middle East.

4. What is your level of education?

   A. Bachelor's degree B. Master's degree C. Beyond Master's

5. What grade level do you teach?

   A. K-3 B. 4-6 C. 7-12

6. What is your current certification?

   A. Instructional I B. Emergency Certificate C. Other

7. Did you have full-time teaching experience prior to your employment in this district?

   A. Yes B. No

8. If you had prior experience, how many years did you have?

   A. 1-3 B. 4-6 C. More than 6

9. Did the induction program include instruction on effective use of instructional classroom time?

   A. Yes B. No

10. Did the induction program include information that provided instruction concerning the effective use of physical space provided in your classroom or work area?

    A. Yes B. No

11. Was the induction process adequate in familiarizing you with background information concerning the school and the students in your geographic area?

    A. Yes B. No

12. Were you exposed to affirmative discipline techniques that enabled you to deal with student discipline effectively?

    A. Yes B. No

13. Did the induction process expose you to classroom techniques designed to accommodate the different learning styles of students?

    A. Yes B. No

14. Did the induction process provide you with enough information to identify at-risk students, students with learning problems, disabilities and other special needs?

    A. Yes B. No

15. Did the induction process adequately cover techniques that would foster positive self-esteem in students and high expectations for each student?

    A. Yes B. No

16. Did the induction process expose you to alternative methods of classroom instruction techniques such as grouping, individualizing, student teams, peer teaching, etc?

A. Yes B. No

17. Did the district's induction plan provide released time for discussion of educational issues with your mentor teacher?

A. Yes B. No

18. Did your induction process include any methods for involving the family in school activities?

A. Yes B. No

19. Did the induction process include information pertaining to cultural differences?

A. Yes B. No

20. Did the induction process include any instruction on conducting professional conferences with parents?

A. Yes B. No

21. Did the induction process provide methods for getting the home and school jointly involved in the student's academic life?

A. Yes B. No

22. Did the induction process provide you with the opportunity to discuss professional issues with your peers on a regular basis?

A. Yes B. No

23. Were you provided with, or have the access to a professional library with up-to-date teaching literature on methods, procedures and research?

A. Yes B. No

24. Were you provided the opportunity to observe colleagues in different teaching situations?

A. Yes B. No

25. Did your mentor teacher rate you or write observations that were used in your rating?

A. Yes B. No

26. Did your mentor teacher observe your teaching techniques and offer any kind of constructive feedback on a regular basis?

A. Yes B. No

27. How often were you able to meet with your mentor during the year to conference about your progress?

A. Weekly B. Monthly C. Once a quarter (6 weeks)
D. Once a semester (15 weeks) E. Once a year

28. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score, and 1 being the lowest score, how would you rate the induction process in terms of helping you to be an effective teacher?

A. 1 B. 2 C. 3 D. 4 E. 5

II. **Overall Response** (Please write your responses to the following questions directly on this sheet in the space provided.

29. If you are a secondary teacher, please indicate the subject area(s) you teach.

30. Briefly list what you consider to be the three (3) major strengths or advantages of the induction process for you in your district.

31. Briefly list what you would consider the three (3) major weaknesses of the induction process as you have experienced it.

APPENDIX M

MENTOR TRAINING SURVEY

Name of person providing response: _____

Name of school district: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____

1. What year did your districts' induction program begin? _____
2. How many teachers, by level, have completed your district's induction program since it began? _____ elementary _____ secondary _____ other
3. What are mentors paid in your district for working with inductees? (please specify exact amount or formula used: _____)

******

The following areas are those most frequently associated with training programs for mentors participating in induction programs. Please review the following and indicate which areas would be of the most value for training mentors in your district. If there are others which do not appear here, feel free to add them at the end. If you wish to rank the areas in terms of most important to least important, please do so, using a scale of 1 for most important to 5 for least important.

_____ A. Mentoring Processes (including concept and purpose of mentoring, roles and responsibilities of mentors; phases of mentoring relationships; needs of new teachers)

_____ B. Clinical Supervision (including analysis of instruction, classroom visitations, observation techniques and conferencing skills)

_____ C. Coaching & Modeling (including effective instructional strategies; demonstration teaching; reinforcing teaching effectiveness; modifying instruction; maintaining professionalism)

_____ D. Adult Development (including characteristics of adult learners; life cycle changes; stages of teacher development and growth; self-reliance and motivation; stress management)

_____ E. Interpersonal Skills (including communication skills, oral and written; problem solving techniques; decision-making skills; active listening skills; effective questioning skills)

_____ F. Other (please specify: _____
_____)

Is your district interested in participating in a mentor training program which would address all or some of the above areas: ___ yes ___ no

Do you wish to receive the full report when it is available? ___ yes ___ no

Please return this survey promptly to: Dr. Charles R. Duke, 101 Stevens Hall, Clarion University, Clarion PA 16214.